(3)

(1)

CH Book

BEFORE THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition No. 3434 Of 2003.

PETITIONER :- Ramesh Chandra Pandey, son of Late Pandit Chandrashekhar Pandey, aged about 65 years, resident of Ram Mandir Road, Brahmanpara, Ambikapur, Sarguja, District Sarguja (Chhattisgarh)

V E R S U S

RESPONDENTS :-1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, Public Works and Nagriya Nikay, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

2. Assistant Director, Town Administration and Development of M.P., Bhopal (Madhya Pradesh)

3. The Deputy Director, Town Administration, Bilaspur Division, Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh).

P. R. No. 3299/03
Presented by Shri Pankaj Agrawal
dated 16.12.03

12/12/03

PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 & 227 OF CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

DETAILS OF PETITION

(37)

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri, J.

W. P. No. 3434 of 2003

Petitioner : Ramesh Chandra Pandey

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others.

Shri Pankaj Agrawal, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Sushil Dubey, Government Advocate for the State.

ORAL ORDER

(10th July, 2006)

1. The petitioner was promoted to the post of Chief Municipal Officer, Class-D Municipality on adhoc basis from the post of Revenue Inspector by order dated 11.9.1986. By order dated 22.12.1990 the petitioner was reverted to the original post of Revenue Inspector. The order of reversion was challenged before the Madhya Pradesh Administrative Tribunal, Jabalpur in O.A. No. 51/1991. It appears that the learned Administrative Tribunal by order dated 22.12.1990 directed the State Government to consider the case of the petitioner again if duly selected candidates are available.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has not stated even the date of appointment, date of reversion and has not produced order passed in O.A. No. 65/1991 whereby, according to the petitioner, the order of reversion

dated 22.12.1990 was quashed. One order dated 28.7.1994 passed in O.A. No. 51/1991 was produced which directs the State Government to consider case of the petitioner. What is the present position is not known. The petition lacks all the relevant materials which are necessary for decision of the case.

3. For the reasons stated above, this petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge